DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 697 CG 012 314

AUTHOR Slawski, Carl
TITLE A Global Family Policy: Means and Aims.
PUB DATE 14 Oct 77
NOTE 29p.; Note available in hard copy due to marginal legibility; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Council on Family Relations (San Diego, California, October 12-15, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Child Rearing; Civil Liberties; *Community Responsibility; Conflict Resolution; Family Counseling; *Family Relationship; Guidelines; *Marriage; Parenthood Education; *Public Policy; Self Actualization; *Social Development

ABSTRACT

The bases for these policy guidelines are traced to an extensive yet largely unimplemented literature, but primarily to the principles of nonviolent conflict resolution, community responsibility, self actualization and social actualization through the implementation of universally recognized human rights. Central emphasis is given to the need for better child development practices in family-oriented, democratically well-planned community settings. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED151697

A GLOBAL FAMILY POLICY:

MEANS AND AIMS

by Carl Slawski, Ph.D.

Of the Sociology Department
California State University
Long Beach, CA 90840

For presentation at the annual meeting of the National Council on Family Relations, section on Family Action, subsection on Family Policy Issues, meeting on October 14, 1977, San Diego, California.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Slawski
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CG012314

A GLOBAL FAMILY POLICY:

MEANS AND AIMS

by Carl Slawski

Background

The author has elsewhere stated recommendations for How to Promote Love and Avoid Harmful Conflict. Those statements constitute the practical bases for the succeeding set of recommendations for a broad public policy. Implications for counseling and self diagnosis will follow closely upon the policy. It should be obvious that it is impossible to make government level recommendations which would have direct and specific impact on individual relationships between parents, children, or parent and child. Government policy may support and influence counseling agencies, and in turn, counselors may employ some of the principles advocated here to help their clients with family problems. This is not to say that government should not concern itself seriously with a comprehensive policy regarding family problems, forms and trends. Recall too that there are four basic levels of possible influence of government on families: 1) regulation, 2) incentive, 3) encouragement, or 4) hands-off (otherwise known as laissez faire). Many transcripts of hearings and government reports have been made in previous years. But the biggest problem, as usual, is the virtually complete lack of government implementation of the recommendations made in these public hearings. Despite such practical problems it will be useful to continue the effort in hopes that a ground swell of concern might be generated. Before making recommendations on a macro-structural level it will be useful to try to formulate a broad view of the family, its functions, needs and broad problems in the context of changes in recent generations, particularly in Western nations. A look will be taken by way of review, at family functions, tasks and

goals of the family, recommendations made by other scholars and interested witnesses, followed by the author's own recommendations. An overview will then be presented in the form of a chart containing five general aims and eight means which governments could use to achieve these ends.

It will first be interesting to note some of the programs that have been set up by both governmental and voluntary organizations. Muriel Brown (in Chrestensen, 1964: 823) lists the diversified agencies that sponsor such activities. They include: 1) agencies that provide basic protection

for all families through systems of national defense, law enforcement, and emergency aid; 2) agencies that conserve and develop natural resources for the use of all families; 3) agencies that keep track of conditions affecting families through surveys, studies, and the continuous collection of statistical data; 4) agencies that interpret family needs and stimulate action to meet them; 5) agencies that educate for parenthood, marriage, homemaking, and family living; 6) agencies that give direct aid to individual families in the form of counseling, financial assistance, medical care, and other kinds of social service; 7) agencies that provide recreational and cultural opportunities for the enrichment of family life; and 8) churches and other organizations that give spiritual comfort and guidance. She goes on (p. 824) to list the agencies of the United Stated government whose programs are most closely related to the concerns of American families: the Departments of Agriculture; Commerce; Defense; Health, Education, and Welfare; Interior; Justice; Labor; the Treasure; the Atomic Energy Commission; the Housing and Home Finance Agency; the Selective Service System; and the Veterans Administration. The problem then is in part to coordinate all government services to families. And coordination in turn is dependent on some overarching philosophy guidelines for directing the separate public policies developed.

A possible logical starting point for making recommendations is the population question. Hauser (in Farson, 1969: 22) notes such major directions as the population explosion (resulting from later deaths than in earlier years), population implosion (or more people on a smaller surface of the earth, namely, in urban areas), diversification (greater variance within groups of people), the accelerated tempo of technological and social change, and the morphological revolution (in which social structural forms moved from the little community to the mass society, and behavior moved from the traditional to the rational, referring largely to the typical authority structures). Hauser (pp. 30-32) then elaborates eight trends

more specific to the family itself. First, in mass societies the trend has been from the extended family to the nuclear family of two generations only. Second, the family has lost most of its functions, particularly those of production and education. Third, the marriage pattern has moved from monogamy to serial polygyny or polandry. Fourth, the family has moved from being a primary group to a secondary group. Fifth, comes a higher proportion of married people, decreasing age of partners at marriage, decreasing age of the onset of childhood, increased concentration of childbearing in the years before a woman reaches thirty, and the almost universal use of family planning methods. As a result, the age of parents when the last child leaves home for marriage has been lowered; the age at which the death of one spouse is experienced has risen markedly, and the number of years in which parents are freed from childbearing and childrearing activities has tremendously increased. Sixth, the role of woman has been transformed from "a female" into "a human being." Seventh, the relationship between spouses is increasingly egalitarian. Eighth, the family has become increasingly less important as an instrument in the socialization of the child.

Paul Glick (1975) gives his related version of <u>recent changes</u> in American families. Some occurrences are the recent delay in marriage among the young, early marriage and high fertility of those approaching middle age, divergence and convergence of divorce by social level, no-fault divorce laws, an increasing number of children living in situations of divorce, and recent changes in living arrangements (few couples living with parents, young adults living away from home, the commune, smaller households, high rate of remarriage among divorcees, etc.) (Later we will refer to the specific directions noted by Glick as possible causes to promote.)

In order to give further focus to the eventual recommendations to be made here we will briefly review some important ideas on violence in

the family. Steinmetz and Straus (1974) have mapped out the general factors which cause intra-family violence, including personal, societal and factors in the family itself. It will be unnecessary to review all these factors here. But it should be noted that any policy ought to take account of all the major background factors and not merely focus on the immediate precipitating factors, curing symptoms and not attempting to manage the causes. (This is brought out especially well in their flow diagram, on pp. 18 and 19.) A more specific formulation of this kind is that by Gelles (in Steinmetz and Straus, 1974) which shows the inadequacy of considering child abuse as psychopathology without also considering the sociological factors which provide the setting and conditions for such abuse. While child abuse is an extreme case, it is a good indicator of the kinds of family problems that ought to get first priority in efforts spent on prevention of family problems. It seems logical that efforts ought to be made to eliminate the worst evils first, while at the same time not forgetting to help create the conditions which make for more constructive and actualizing relationships and community atmospheric conditions. It is also reasonable to assume that the future of society depends largely on the socialization of the children of this generation, which in turn depends on the parent-child relationships, and again in turn on parent-parent relationships. Recall too that both of these types of relationships are strongly influenced by work and other societal conditions.

It is useful also to remind ourselves at this point of the various other types of family crises. Hill and Hansen (in Christenson, 1964: 793) provide us with such a classified list. There are four general types of family crises, I) Dismemberment only (including death of child, spouse, or parent; hospitalization of spouse, or war separation). II) There are crises of accession only (including unwanted pregnancy; deserter returns; stepfather, stepmother additions; some war reunions; some adoptions;

aged grandparents, or orphaned kin). There are crises of demoralization only (including nonsupport; infidelity; alcoholism; drug addiction; and delinquency and events bringing disgrace). Finally there are crises of demoralization plus dismemberment or accession (including illegitimacy; runaways; desertion; divorce; imprisonment; suicide or homicide; and finally institutionalization for mental illness or mental retardation). With these crises and family violence placed into critical focus, it will now be useful to take a very broad holistic view before beginning to make any specific, macro-level recommendations.

Family Functions, Tasks and Goals

After beginning to zero in on the major problems, let us take a look at some of the major goals and general functions of families. Goode (in Merton et al, 1959: 188-189) lists six functions of the family: 1) fertility, 2) conferring status, 3) socializing children, 4) biological maintenance, 5) emotional maintenance, and 6) social control (over children as well as of spouses over sexual fidelity). A similar but somewhat more directional list is that of Hill and Rodgers on the seven developmental tasks (in Christensen, 1964: 187): a) reproduction, b) physical maintenance, c) protection, d) education and socialization, e) recreation, f) status-conferring, and g) affection-giving.

Another possible general schema available for analyzing family problems is Erikson's eight stages of man, which focuses on virtues to be developed by individuals from birth to a mature age, centering on self identity. Although it has strong social relevance this schema does not use a group or type of relationship, let alone the family unit itself as its major focus. Despite this incompleteness, a field theory would do well to consider this developmental theory of social and interpersonal growth.

A traditional view of the family has almost invariably been held by nearly all major religions. The 1973 Senate Hearings on the American Family included testimony and a joint statement by four major religions, Catholic, Jewish, Orthodox and Protestant (pp. 276-279). They say that marriage ought to be a continuing, supportive relationship in which each partner helps the other to develop to fullest capacity. Parenthood is for procreation and nurturing of each child in a responsible way. Family life is the cradle of personality and creates the environment for societal values. A father and mother ought to guide and develop and provide the security necessary for development of mature and responsible relationships between men and women. The family shapes the attitudes, hopes, ambitions and values of every citizen. Their goal is to explore all ways to preserve and strengthen family life so that each person may enjoy fulfillment in dignity, justice, and peace. An Interfaith Commission invited all to think about these matters and to report significant interfaith activities on the following topics: 1) Education of children and youth in sexual understanding and family roles; 2) preparation of couples for marriage; 3) assistance to parents in child rearing; 4) enrichment of husband-wife and parent-child relationships; 5) development of community responsibility in families; 6) efforts to improve housing education, and a better environment for all families, and finally, 7) endeavors to improve laws and community services as they relate to families. The churches' policies seem to sanction all the traditional functions and goals and tasks of the family, assuming virtually without question that the family is indeed central to social control. Doubts could be raised about this central function, especially in the face of highly significant recent changes in the forms and functions of the family in both the sacred and the secular world.

In addition to the ideas mentioned above, another view of some recent major changes in the American family are (according to Bardis, in Christensen, 1964: 459) as follows: a) individual choice of mate based on romantic love; b) decline in parental authority; c) emancipation of women; d) reduced family size; e) emphasis on child welfare; f) decline in the economic, educational, religious, recreational and protective functions of the family; and g) prevalence of various forms of disorganization. On a more global scale, Stroup (in Farson, 1969) philosophizes that the medieval age of faith has been demystified, and was succeeded by the age of ideology (typified by Freud and Marx). He suggests a kind of dialectical progression of types of ethical principles through history from 1) the prescriptive to 2) the teleological or purposeful ethics (where people set their own individual goals), to 3) situational ethics (in which individuals seek to know what is right only for the present, or for a particular situation).

The latter progression is consistent at a different level with the recent movement toward humanistic psychology. This is exemplified best by Maslow's need ladder, in which there is a gradual progression to individual self actualization by means of gradually learning to satisfy one's basic needs for survival, security and safety, love and affection, self esteem, and finally self actualization itself. A particular application of this line of thought is expressed well by Farson (in Farson, 1969: 55f.). He makes three main points. "First, the quality of family life is far better than it has ever been and it will achieve new heights in the future. Second,---and here is the paradox---precisely because of this improvement there will be increased discontent and family failure. Third, family service agencies must completely recast their role and redirect their programs so that families can invent their own futures." Obviously he takes an optimistic view, presuming that most people are beyond the need to struggle to make money to support and feed themselves and their families.

Whitehurst (in Steinmetz and Straus, 1974: 320) does a more thorough job of systematically comparing changes from conventional families to alternate families through a programmatic statement:

Conventional Families	Alternate Families
Live in relative privacy——permits hidden, cloistered, non-solution to problems; denies existence of difficulties.	Live in relatively public life arena——less behavior hidden——denial of problems is more difficult.
Few tension-release mechanisms; those that do exist often become stilted, cyclical, and unlikely to produce breakthroughs or change short of divorce.	Tension-release mechanisms often built into daily life structure; heavy norms of interpersonal honesty, peer pressures to resolve tensions and get on with living.
Major orientation to external sanctions and rewards——conformity related to rewards offered by outside world's goals. Heavy achievement ethic——behavior related to means to achieve.	Major orientation toward personal growth potential——sanctions (rewards) sought at hands of internal group; "achievement" is predicted on Gestalt assumption of filling out own life style.
Solutions to problems (intrafamilial) seen in terms of above rewards, establishment goals. A priori answers to problems sought in moral (Biblical) or legal codes.	Solutions to problems seen in Gestalt terms; group-defined, self-growth possibilities explored open-endedly. New answers sought in means-ends scheme.
Truncated (real) social control network (husband, wife, few outsiders, of real importance). External controls perceived as real, but are impersonal——in form of agencies, etc. These sanctioning reference groups not available for immediate help in crisis.	Expanded social control network includes significant others outside spouses. The sanctioning reference groups are real and intimate in the lives of family members; are immediately available for crisis help.

In a related vein, Otto (in Wiseman, 1962: 481-485) gives a thoughtful definition of "What Is a Strong Family?" in eleven statements. A strong family is composed of:

1) The ability to provide for the physical, emotional, and spiritual needs of a family.

2) The ability to be sensitive to the needs of the family members.

3) The ability to communicate.

4) The ability to provide support, security, and encouragement.

5) The ability to establish and maintain growth-producing relationships

within and without the family.

6) The capacity to maintain and create constructive and responsible community relationships in the neighborhood and in the school, town, local and state governments.

7) The ability to grow with and through children.

8) An ability for self-help, and the ability to accept help when appropriate.

9) An ability to perform family roles flexibly.

10) Mutual respect for the individuality of family members.

11) A concern for family unity, loyalty, and interfamily cooperation.

These dictums could be translated into more general norms for assessing 1) responsible love relationships in general, or 2) integral or "together" or "organic" communes as well. Together these latter statements of Otto, Whitehurst and Farson will provide the broad humanistic criteria for making more explicit policy recommendations about the family which will follow shortly in this paper. They all support the ideas behind the present author's model of love, power and conflict (as presented above).

A Collection of Recommendations

To begin with, let us examine the six directions which Glick (1975) feels are worth considering as causes to forward:

1. The development of the contents for more practical and effective training at home, in the high schools, and in colleges about how young persons can make a wise selection of their marriage partner and how they can keep their marriage alive and healthy over a long period of time——and about how they can use reasonable criteria to decide whether it is any longer practical to keep their marriage intact (Broderick and Bernard, 1969).

2. Designing a scientifically tested and appealing system for selecting a marriage partner, for bringing together young men and women who would have a much higher probability of establishing an enduring and satisfying marriage than could be expected through the almost universally haphazard system that now exists——at the same time realizing that the rational approach must be supplemented by the strength of emotional appeal (Glick, 1967).

3. Acceptance by the public of the concept of periodic marriage checkups through visits to highly expert marriage counselors (when a sufficient supply becomes available), with these visits occurring in a manner analogous to periodic physical checkups that are voluntarily made, and with the visits considered urgent when a seemingly dangerous marital condition is developing.

4. Continuing modernization of marriage and divorce laws, which would tend to encourage couples to take much more seriously their entry into marriage but not quite so seriously as some couples do the hazards of ending a marriage that is no longer worthy of continuation.

5. Development of child care facilities staffed by highly professional personnel, so that more mothers can feel free to maximize the alternatives available for the use of their time while their children are growing up—— provided that careful attention is given in choosing the ways in which the additional free time is used (Campbell, 1973; Low and Spindler, 1968).

6. Finally, programs to increase the appeal of experiencing a good marriage, including the continued collection and dissemination of knowledge about how to cultivate such a marriage——so that more emphasis can be placed on building up the positive side of married life, in a period when so many stimuli that reach the public have the effect of making nonmarriage appear to be much more desirable (Mace and Mace, 1974).

Continuing to look at the demographic perspective, Kammeyer cites some pertinent recommendations from the Report of the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future (1972: ch. 40: 457-465):

> The Commission...recommends that: (1) states eliminate existing legal inhibitions and restrictions on access to contraceptive information, procedures, and supplies; and (2) states develop statutes affirming the desirability that all persons have ready and practicable access to contraceptive information, procedures, and supplies....
>
> We recommend that states adopt affirmative legislation which will permit minors to receive contraceptive and prophylactic information and services in appropriate settings sensitive to their needs and concerns.
>
> To implement this policy, the Commission urges that organizations, such as the Council on State Governments, the American Law Institute, and the American Bar Association, formulate appropriate model statutes....

> The Commission...recommends the development and implementation of an adequately financed program to develop appropriate family planning materials, to conduct training courses for teachers and school administrators, and to assist states and local communities in integrating information about family planning into school courses such as hygiene and sex education.

On a somewhat related topic, the testimony by Williams of Parents Without Partners to the Senate Hearings (1973: 203) gave as their number one priority "meaningful Day Care and Child Development legislation." In addition, the organization also suggests the following:

1. A total end, in fact as well as theory, to class discrimination based on sex or marital status in the areas of housing, credit and insurance.
2. Immediate tax reform which, in fairness and equity, will equalize the tax base between married couples and heads of households; such legislation to provide for the deduction of child care expenses as a business deduction rather than a personal deduction and, in addition, a percentage consideration for the dependent deduction when two parties not in the same household contribute to child support.
3. A re-examination by the Armed Services as well as other governmental departments of all policies covering transfers and family relocations. (I've been told by many marriage counselors, psychiatrists and psychologists that the chances of marriage dissolution rise sharply—at least 50%—following a family relocation. I believe it.)
4. The Armed Services should re-examine all their policies covering dependents with particular reference to control of allotments for child support and alimony.
5. Uniform standards by all states in divorce codes should be encouraged by the Federal Government with particular attention to "no-fault" provisions. The archaic divorce codes in many of our states encourage the adversary system in divorce practice by lawyers and usually brands a party "guilty" or "at fault". This does not end the contenticusness which divorce purports to cure and has long term, deleterious effects on children.
6. Uniform child custody and support laws and enforcement.

Easily the most thorough and potentially fruitful recommendations of these Hearings (or for that matter of any literature I have been able to discover on family policy) is the statement of Urie Bronfenbrenner before the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth (1973), based on his article entitled "The Roots of Alienation". It is worth quoting him at length (pp. 445-447 of Hearings of 1973): He first considers neighborhoods and communities as support systems, suggesting the following possibilities: 1) Commission

for Children and Families. 2) Neighborhood Family Centers. 3) Community and Neighborhood Projects. 4) Participation of Youth in Local Policy Bodies. And 5) Community and Neighborhood Planning.

Even more broadly speaking, Bronfenbrenner elaborates what he calls "The American Family Act of 1974, Suggested Principles and Provisions" (Hearings, 1973: 172-177). A more complete citation of this proposed Act will be cited in the appendix to the present paper.

General Guidelines for Public Policy

With all of this as background, we will now state some general guidelines for public policy on a predominantly macro level which can be derived rather directly from the model of love, power and conflict elaborated in the earlier and major portion of this paper. Any program would provide flexibility or more creative options in caring for the physical well-being and facilitating the education of their children should be encouraged and positively promoted with incentives (such as through tax deductions, research funds, development programs and conferences, support for educational and counseling enterprises).

The parent-child relationship will probably have more influence on the future of society than any other single type of relationship (followed by peers, teacher-student, boss-worker, and government-citizen types).

An evidentially-based set of broad-ranging principles should inform such programs (rather than small-scale off-hand eclecticism). Creative ethnographic case studies employing holistic approaches and philosophies ought to be allowed to take over the highest priority (rather than the common proliferation of data on insignificant hypotheses or with invalid measures taken in highly controlled and unnatural laboratory settings).

Programs and studies must focus on relationships and not just separate individuals, on whole families, on long-term socialization practices, on families and peer groups in their neighborhood and in their multiphasic social environments, on whole subcultures.

Focus in research, development and educational programs ought to be on smooth-handling of normal conflict situations, not merely on major crises or stop-gap measures. The goal would of course be to prevent these major crises from arising in the first place, or if they should arise, to be able to cope with them in more productive, or even in socially-actualizing ways.

Implied in the above model of love, power and conflict is the belief

that a failure in a love relationship should not necessarily lead to a hate relationship. Imagination and the furtherance of the above-stated counseling recommendations should allow us to promote the possibility of moving such a relationship to one of relative indifference or to a division of labor on the troublesome issues or toward breaking down the broader conflicts into manageable small items.

Fair fighting in agreed-upon times and channels can be a practical and livable rule of procedure. The model presented above assumes that conflict is natural and must be dealt with continually. If this is understood conflict will not be collectively repressed so that it comes out in irrational ways. It is understood also that intensity of family relations will probably lead to increased conflict if it breaks out. This realization means that in most cases it is possible to avoid the guilt-over-conflict syndrome.

The possibility of smooth-handling of normal conflict should be aided by the realization that love (as defined elsewhere by the author) is rare and should be viewed as a goal rather than a proximate expectation for every relationship or every encounter. It is a goal which cannot be reached by conscious, fully-planned striving. It is indicated by peak experiences, which do not admit of engineering principles. The best one can do is to prepare the way and avoid known dead-ends.

Certain consequences of loving conflict resolution will now be noted, especially as they affect government policies regarding family dyads.

"Good" family relations can provide an insulator against delinquency, according to Reckless (196) and his containment theory. This implies also that there is a naturally occurring mutual reinforcement of a "good self concept", good family relations and a law-abiding citizenry.

Knowledge and experience of how to resolve conflicts in one's family

ought to predispose more family members to choose careers and work actively to:

1) Try to promote smoother conflict resolution on a larger scale, such as

A) in international relations,

B) in bureaucracies in government and industry,

C) in neighborhoods, say concerning ethnic group integration problems.

2) Try to be more successful in their attempts to negotiate for better group and diplomatic relations.

On the principle of "transference of learning", if the principles in the author's model of conflict resolution were more universally applied,

1) Violence would be minimized in the world,

2) Democratic relations between persons and parties would be promoted as well as justice, equality among peoples and the privileged position of personhood and individuals' attempts to achieve self actualization.

Attainment of a population optimum (size) insofar as it is related to optimum family size would hopefully be related to better information transmitted among an educated populace (which presumes that better education will be facilitated by better family relations).

In general, more satisfied family members make for a more productive or peaceful society.

Any government can at best provide the resources in a thoroughgoing manner in collaboration with its constituents, and then publicize the availability of such resources. The dole and the bread-line, food stamps and handouts are only stop-gap measures. The chance for meaningful work which uses and fulfills the worker's capacities should be the chief priority of public policy, followed by time and resources available for creative use of leisure time, together with an effective sense of community cooperation

in the process of setting lesser priorities. (Some churches provide a model for this, such as the Mormons' provision and care for all their members.)

Somewhat incidentally, another consequence of flexible government policy would be that obscenity and pornography would be promoted only to the extent that parents permit or encourage it in their own children.

Government's chronologically first priority should be to somehow set up the conditions and resources and services which will prevent the worst evils, violence among intimates, child abuse, malnutrition, preventable disease, involuntary poverty, and the virtual impossibility for certain people to employ their talents in some useful occupation. Then the possibility for maximizing use of individual talents should be attended to in hopes of reaching a greater joint payoff not only for one's immediate family, but for the larger community. In the words of the China watchers—— Friendship first, then productivity.

Buddhist economics (Schumacher, 1973) and the concept of Small Is Beautiful ought to be encouraged. Buddhist economics can be summed up in the following principle: "Take what you need and leave the rest for someone else." This is sound ecology, economics and energy policy in the broadest sense.

The possible bases for a realistic utopian community are: 1) maximized individual productivity, 2) maximized collective productivity, 3) individual self-actualization, 4) deep intergroup relationships, and 5) deep interpersonal relationships. My priority among these is in in reverse order (namely, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1). It should be clear that all are necessary, in a certain balance, and intercontingent with one another. However, productivity rarely needs to be maximized and should not be maximized at the expense of personal relationships after the basic survival needs of the

larger communities have been reasonably satisfied, including the community of nations.

It is this author's considered opinion that, in general, good relationships between parent-figures will have the strongest effect on and carry-over to the crucial parent-child relationship. And these in turn will set limits to the probable life styles or interaction styles of the next generation.

Naturally, from a broader sociological point of view, the type of market economy extant will promote a characteristic atmosphere of human relationships which the bread-winner and parents in turn bring home to their relationships with family members in general and children in particular. One would expect for example that a competitive and individualistic market economy would promote competition and conflict among family members. Whereas a cooperative class-communitarian market economy if consistently pursued would lead to a promotion of more satisfying relationships between groups and persons. Contradictions would never be absent. But a mechanism for resolving them would be incorporated in the natural ongoing processes of the social order. The tension between this and the next generation of parents will always be with us. And the quality of these tensions and conflict-resolution processes provides us with the best barometer for forecasting the future quality of human life on planet Earth.

X In the international arena, the major goal should be to protect human dignity according to the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948; especially articles 16, 25, as well as 18-24 and 26-29). Virtually all such protection of human rights should naturally reinforce the possibility for promoting loving relations between all persons who are affected by the climate of their society. And who is the exception?

This paper will now end with a summary statement of desired aims and means for a global family policy.

FAMILY POLICY MEANS AND AIMS

AIMS: (All necessary, but in order of priority):

1. Defuse or Avoid Violence within families (between and among parents and children). (This presumes also between groups and nations.)

2. Facilitation of Fuller Child Development in an atmosphere of family-community cooperation.

3. Facilitation of Whole family satisfaction, concerning 1) joint productivity or "industry", and 2) mutually enjoyable enterprises and use of recreation time, with provision and accommodation to bring in interested single persons and childless couples.

4. Societal Actualization: based largely on 1) the U.S. Bill of Rights, 2) the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights, and 3) in general, cross-cultural appreciation.

5. Individual member Self-Actualization.

Hierarchy of Prepotent MEANS: (all necessary, but in order of priority):

1. Sustenance/Survival Needs: Food, Clothing, Shelter for all persons.
   A) With special emphasis on community-centered housing arrangements.

2. Health benefits for all individuals.

3. Neighborhood and Community-oriented, creative child care centers, planned in neighborhoods, by and for whole families and quasi-families (i.e., any parent-child relationship).

4. Gainful employment to utilize talents of all persons, i.e., job availability.

5. Counseling services for all individuals and families as units.

6. Family-life education, especially concerning: theory and practice of accepting/loving conflict resolution patterns (as per above model of love, power and conflict).

7. Longitudinal and continuing, comprehensive, theoretical and holistic research programs on the use of the above-mentioned means, and on the achievement of the above aims (including support of graduate education in family and marriage counseling degree programs).

8. Federal and state government, as well as United Nations agencies to coordinate and monitor policy and practice on all of the above means and aims, with a view toward visualizing families and quasi-family relationships as wholes and in their respective social contexts.

Appendix

The following is taken from the testimony of Urie Bronfenbrenner in the Senate Hearings before the Subcommittee on Children and Youth, entitled American Families: Trends and Pressures, 1973, pp. 172-179.

The American Family Act of 1974

Suggested Principles and Provisions

A. Principles

1. The family is the most humane, effective, and economical system of child care known to man. The first aim of any child care program, therefore, should be to strengthen the family and enable the parents to function as parents for their children. This can be best accomplished by providing a variety of support systems for the family in the home, neighborhood, place of work, and community.

2. All programs should be family-centered rather than merely child-centered. This means service to parents as well as to children, and opportunity for the involvement of parents in the planning and execution of programs both within and outside the home. Research results indicate that where programs have involved families as a whole there is greater likelihood of lasting effect beyond the duration of the program itself, with an impact not only on the target child but other children in the family as well. Also such programs tend to be more economical because of the greater participation of family members in the work of the program.

3. During the first six years of life, particularly during the first three, an enduring one-to-one relationship is especially important for the child's development. For this reason special encouragement should be given to arrangements which permit one of the two parents to work part-time. In particular, welfare eligibility requirements should not discriminate against families in which one or both parents are working part-time rather than full-time.

4. Many families today are unable to function effectively to meet the needs of their children because of circumstances beyond their control.

The principal debilitating factor is poverty. Others include reduction of the family to only two adults, or, in many instances, only a single parent; the involvement of both parents in full-time jobs; working on different shifts; the social isolation of families——especially the mother——because of the breakdown of neighborhoods. Measures designed to alleviate these conditions can contribute in reenabling parents to function more effectively. Hence such measures should become a part of any comprehensive child care program, especially because they are more economical in the long run.

5. In addition to the parents, other persons can play a significant role both in relation to the child himself and in providing support to those primarily engaged in his care, especially to the mother. The most important persons in this regard are other family members such as grandparents, aunts, uncles, older brothers and sisters, but also neighbors, friends, teachers, social workers, and other professionals. Finally, the research evidence also points to the powerful impact of older children on the development of the young. Therefore, both on psychological and economic grounds, an effective child care program should utilize and encourage the involvement of other adults and older children in the care of the young.

6. To be effective, programs must be comprehensive in nature not only in relation to the needs of the child but also those of his family in the areas of health, education and social services. For example, the most effective and economical measure to insure the health of the child may often be to meet the health problems of his parents, or of other sick, handicapped, or aged family members who sap the parents' strength and resources.

7. Families live in widely differing circumstances. Any program of child care services must therefore supply a variety of options. In accordance with this principle, child care services should not be limited to group day care provided outside the home.

B. "Family Support Systems"

1. Revision of Welfare and Work Legislation

No single parent of young children should be forced to work full time or more to provide an income at or below the poverty line. The statement applies with equal force to families in which both parents are compelled to work full time or longer to maintain a minimal subsistence level. Under such circumstances, a parent wishing to do so should be enabled to remain at home for part of the day. The following measures could help achieve this objective:

a. Welfare legislation should be amended so as to encourage rather than penalize low income parents, especially single parents, who wish to work only part-time in order to be able themselves to care for their own children.

b. To free parents in poverty from full-time employment so that one of them can care for the children. Federal and state programs should provide funds for part-time parental child care at home in lieu of wages.

c. There should be legal prohibition against unlimited compulsory overtime for parents with young children.

d. Federal or state legislatures should pass Fair Part-Time Employment Practices Acts prohibiting discrimination in job opportunity, rate of pay, seniority, fringe benefits and job status for parents who seek or are engaged in part-time employment.

2. Incentive Programs

a. Tax incentives should be extended to businesses and industries who set up family and child care services for their employees such as day care programs, part-time work opportunities, flexible working hours, special programs designed to acquaint children and young people with the world of work, etc. In particular, employers should be encouraged through tax benefits to modify work schedules so as to enable parents to be home when their children return from preschool or school thus decreasing the need for babysitters during the

child's waking hours or for "latchkey" arrangements for older children.

b. Special incentives should be provided for the development of neighborhood and community-wide programs benefiting families and children, especially on a non-age-segregated basis.

d. Incentives should be offered to groups responsible for the design of neighborhoods, housing projects, apartment complexes, churches, industrial sites, urban renewal projects, etc., to provide for the needs of children and families in the planning of these environments. For example, apartment complexes should incorporate day care facilities adapted for parent participation, large housing projects should be provided with a family neighborhood center.

e. Incentives should be offered to schools for introducing programs involving older children in responsibility for the young both within the school and in neighborhood settings (including the old and the sick, and also for the development of programs which bring members of the community in contact with school children so as to reduce the widening gap between the worlds of childhood and adolescence on the one hand, and the world of adults on the other.

3. Family Impact Assessment

Both Houses of Congress and analogous governmental bodies at state and local levels should change or establish committees to monitor all legislation or proposals coming before the body in question for possible impact in the welfare of families and children.

4. Homemaker Services

Many disadvantaged or single parents are unable to spend time in activities with their young children because of other demands in the home, such as care of old or sick relatives, meeting the needs of a large family, housekeeping under difficult conditions, etc. Local residents trained as homemakers, or high school students in special programs (see above) could take over some of these responsibilities during regular visits so that the

parent could be free to engage in activities with the younger child.

5. Group Day Care

a. Day care eligibility should not be limited to parents engaged in full-time employment.

b. Some off-hour and around-the-clock day care should be available.

c. Some provisions should be made for the availability of emergency day care when parents are sick, incapacitated, or for other urgent reasons temporarily unable to provide adequate care for their children.

d. In the establishment of care programs, provision should be made for the involvement of other family members besides the parents, such as adult relatives, and older children of the family.

6. Training Programs for Child Care Workers

These should be available for persons of all ages by including them in the curricula of high schools, adult education programs, community colleges, etc. They should incorporate as a regular feature voluntary child care services while in the period of training. This would make available large numbers of trained personnel at low cost for families who need such assistance.

7. Commissions for Children and Families

Federal encouragement should be given for the establishment of such commissions at the neighborhood or community level. They would have as their initial charge finding out what the community is doing, for its children and their families. The commission would examine the adequacy of existing programs such as maternal and child health services, family planning clinics, day care facilities, social service and recreational opportunities. They also would have the responsibility for looking at the entire community as an environment for children. Attention would be given not only to institutions and programs designed explicitly to serve families and children, but also to town planning, housing traffic, entertainment, parks, urban developments, adequacy of public transportation, etc.

from the point of view of meeting the needs of families and their children. The commission would be expected to report its findings and recommendations to appropriate executive bodies and to the public at large through the mass media. After completing the initial assessment phase, the commission would assume continued responsibility for developing and monitoring programs to implement its recommendations.

8. Research

Provision should be made for studies designed to assess the comparative effectiveness of specific strategies for furthering the development of children and families. Unlike the massive surveys employed to date, such investigations should focus on specific components of particular programs rather than attempting an indiscriminate evaluation of many complex programs differing in content, clientele, and social setting.

9. A Family-Centered Employment Policy in the Federal Government

The Federal Government as an employer should be mandated to set an example by adopting, at least on an experimental basis, the policies and practices proposed in these recommendations.

REFERENCES

The American Academy of Political and Social Science
1969 "Progress in Family Law". (Entire issue of May.)

Christensen, Harold T. (ed.)
1964 Handbook of Marriage and the Family. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Esterson, Aaron
1970 The Leaves of Spring, Schizophrenia, Family and Sacrifice. Middlesex: Pelican.

Farson, Richard E., P. Hauser, H. Strong, and A. J. Wiener
1969 The Future of the Family. New York: Family Service Association of America.

Glick, Paul C.
1975 "Some recent changes in American families." Current Population Reports, Special Studies, Series P-23, No. 52. Washington: Bureau of the Census, U. S. Government Printing Office.

Goode, William J.
1959 "The Sociology of the Family: Horizons in Family Theory." Pp. 188-189 in Robert K. Merton, L. Broom and L. S. Cottrell, Jr. (eds.), Sociology Today: Problems and Prospects.

Kammeyer, Kenneth C. W. (ed.)
1975 Confronting the Issues, Sex Roles, Marriage and the Family. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. Article "Human Reproduction." From Population and the American Future, the Report of the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, 1972.

Maslow, Abraham
1962 Toward a Psychology of Being. New York: Van Nostrand (Insight).

Otto, Herbert A.
1962 "What is a Strong Family?" Marriage and Family Living (February): 77-80. Reprinted as pp. 481-485 in J. Wiseman, People as Partners. San Francisco: Canfield, 1971.

Rockefeller, John D., III, and the Commission on population growth and the American Future
1972 Population and the American Future, The Report of the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. New York: New American Library (Signet).

Reckless, Walter
1970? The Crime Problem.

Schumacher, E. F.
1973 Small Is Beautiful, Economics as if People Mattered. New York: Perennial Library.

Slawski, Carl
1977 "Love, Power and Conflict: A Systems Model of Interparty Negotiation." Proceedings of Annual North American Meeting of the Society for General Systems Research: Denver (February).

Subcommittee on Children and Youth of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, Ninety-Third Congress.
1974 First session on Examination of the Influence that Governmental Policies Have on American Families, Hearings.
"American Families: Trends and Pressures, 1973." Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Steinmetz, Suzanne K., and Murray A. Straus (eds.)
1974 Violence in the Family. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co.

United Nations
1948 "Universal Declaration on Human Rights." New York: United Nations, Dec. 10, 1948.